



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,306	04/24/2007	Colin John Francis Phillip Jones	237P003USWO	4474
23322	7590	04/14/2008		
IPLM GROUP, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 18455 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418			EXAMINER ALLEN, CAMERON J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/583,306	Applicant(s) JONES ET AL.	
	Examiner CAMERON J. ALLEN	Art Unit 1797	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period **will** apply and **will** expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply **will**, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/18/2006, 11/09/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 15-21, drawn to a method.

Group II, claim(s) 1-14, drawn to an apparatus.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The corresponding technical feature of groups I and II is an electrode system configured to dewater material using at least one electrode made of a synthetic material. Miller et al. US 2003/0150789 discloses an electrode system configured to dewater material using at least one electrode made of a synthetic material. The corresponding technical feature therefore does not make a contribution over the prior art and there is no single general inventive concept that links the two groups together. Therefore, there is a lack of unity of invention in the groups of inventions claimed by the applicant.

During a telephone conversation with William Prout on 4/7/2008, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, claims 1-14.

Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.

Claims 15-21 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37

CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller et al. US 2003/0150789 A1.

Regarding claim 1, Miller teaches an apparatus capable of reducing the liquid content of a material comprising a particulate/liquid dispersion or suspension, the apparatus comprising:

A receiving zone to contain the material (0010), at least one pair of electrodes spaced apart within the receiving zone (0011 and 0012), having a potential difference there across and hence across the material in use to drive electro-kinetic dewatering (0021), and a drain means to enable removal of water (0031), wherein at least one of the electrodes comprises a textile or other synthetic material at least in part associated with a conductor so as to constitute where so associated a conducting electrokinetic textile or other synthetic material. (0035)

Regarding claim 2, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 1 for reducing the liquid content of a material comprising a dispersion or suspension of

inorganic particles being a byproduct of mining, manufacturing or other industrial processes. (0047) *The examiner interprets the sludge to be a byproduct of an industrial process, such as waste water treatment.*

Regarding claim 4, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 1 wherein the drain is formed as an integral structure with the conducting electrokinetic textile or other synthetic material electrode. (0034 and 0035)

Regarding claim 5, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 4 wherein the receiving zone is at least partly defined by a filtration membrane permeable to the liquid but impermeable to at least some and more preferably substantially all of the particulate solids contained within the material, which filtration membrane comprises a textile or other synthetic material at least in part associated with a conductor so as to constitute where so associated the said conducting electro kinetic textile or other synthetic electrode.(0035)

Regarding claim 6, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 5 wherein, the filter membrane is a sheet-like material having a primarily polymeric base structure. (0035)

Regarding claim 7, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 6 wherein the filter membrane includes conducting elements in a composite material composition. (0035)

Regarding claim 8, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 5 wherein the apparatus further comprises a separate conductor so disposed within the apparatus as to be caused during use to come into contact with the filtration membrane

material over at least a part of the area thereof. (0039) *The examiner interprets conductor 14 to come in contact with the filter material.*

Regarding claim 9, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with one of claims 5 wherein the electrode at least partly comprises a conductor, either in that the material is inherently conducting or in that it integrally incorporates conductive material into its structure. (0034 and 0035) The examiner interprets metal to be inertly conducting.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 3, 10 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller et al. US 2003/0150789 A1.

Regarding claim 3, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 1 but does not teach wherein the second electrode is also a conducting electro kinetic textile or other synthetic material. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a synthetic mater for the second electrode, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis on its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. Miller mentions the use of synthetic material for an electrode in paragraph 35.

Regarding claim 10, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 9 but does not teach wherein the electrode comprises a conducting, geosynthetic material. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use geosynthetic material for the electrode, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis on its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. Miller mentions the use of synthetic material for an electrode in paragraph 35.

Regarding claim 14, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 10 wherein the electrode comprises inherently conducting material, for example being polymeric material loaded with conducting particles. (0034 and 035)

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller US 2003/0150789 in further view of Netlon Limited GB 2,327,686.

Regarding claim 10, Miller teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 9 but does not teach wherein the electrode comprises a conducting, geosynthetic material. The Netlon limited reference teaches the use of geosynthetic material in combination with electro kinetics. (Page 1 line 1-17) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the synthetic material for the electrode in the Miller reference with the geosynthetic material in the Netlon reference, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis on its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. The geosynthetic material is known to be effective, so it would be an obvious choice of available materials.

Regarding claim 11, Miller in view of the Netlon reference teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 10 wherein the electrode comprises a generally inherently non-conductive geosynthetic material in association with at least one metallic or non-metallic conducting dement to produce a composite conducting geosynthetic material.

Regarding claim 12, Miller in view of the Netlon reference teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 11 wherein the electrokinetic material comprises a woven or

Art Unit: 1797

non-woven polymeric material incorporating a plurality of elongate conducting elements there within, in particular in one or more parallel arrays. (Miller 0035)(Netlon Page 1 1-17)

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller US 2003/0150789, Netlon Limited GB 2,327,686, and Kunkle et al. (US 4,680,104).

Regarding claim 13, Miller in view of the Netlon reference teaches an apparatus in accordance with claim 11 but does not teach wherein a conducting element comprises metal coated in mixed metal oxide. Kunkle does teach the use of a conducting element comprises metal coated in mixed metal oxide. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Miller in view of Netlon with Kunkle and use a conducting element comprising of metal coated in mixed metal oxide since it is known in the art that metal oxides are effective in dewatering. It is within the ordinary skill of one in the art to use methods known to work. (Example US 4,680,104 Kunkle et al. Column 8 line 55-60)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CAMERON J. ALLEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3164. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9-7pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1447. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CJA

/Walter D. Griffin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797